REMARKS

Prior to this Response, claims 2, 3, 5 , 7-18, 21-23, 25-35, 37, 38, 40-42, 44-67, and 82-84 were pending and claims 1, 4, 6, 19, 20, 24, 36, 39, 43, 68-81 had been canceled.

In this response, claims 2, 21-23, 25, 30, 34, 40, 44, 45, 66, 67, and 82-84 have been amended and claims 5, 32, 33, 37, 41, and 42 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 7-18, 21-23, 25-31, 34, 35, 38, 40, 44-67, 82, 38, and 82-84 are currently pending.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7-18, 21, 22, 25-27, 29, 34, 35, 37, 38, 44-63, 65-67, and 82-84 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaply (U.S. Pat. No. 6,112,215) in view of Light et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,192,380) and in further view of Atlas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,339). Claims 28 and 64 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaply in view of Light et al. and in further view of Bogdan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,284). Claims 31-33 and 40-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaply in view of Light et al. and in further view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,199,079).

These rejection are respectfully traversed.

In particular, claim 2 has been amended to further recite that "*the electronic form is received from a visited network site*" and that "*obtaining program code includes determining whether the program code resides in a local database utilizing a Universal Resource Locator (URL) of the visited network site obtained from a local browser, and contacting a remote database via a network to determine whether the program code resides in the remote database if the program code does not reside in the local database.*" As recited in claim 2, a determination is first made locally (using an URL extracted from the browser) to determine whether the relevant program code is available locally. If it is determined that the program code is not available locally, then a remote database is contacted via the network to determine whether the remote database has the

relevant program code. None of the cited prior art discloses, teaches or suggests this combination of limitations (together with the remaining limitations of amended claim 2). As a result, claim 2, as amended, is now believed to be patentable over Kaply in view of Light et al. and further in view of Atlas et al. Claims 3, 7-18, 21-23, 25-31 depend from amended claim 2 and therefore are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from amended claim 2.

In addition, claim 30 has also be amended to now recite that the URL of the visited network site is compared against a first set of URLs for which program code is supposed to be available residing in the local database and then compared against a second set of URLs for which program code is supposed to be available residing in the remote database if the program code does not reside in the local database. Kaply in view of Light et al. and further in view of Gupta et al. are not believed to teach, disclose or suggest the combination of limitations as now recited in amended claim 30.

Claim 34 has been amended to recite that "*the communications engine retrieves the program code by comparing the electronic form of the visited network site against a first set of electronic forms for which program code is supposed to be available, the set second of electronic forms residing in a local database, and wherein the communications engine contacts a remote database via a network to compare the electronic form of the visited network site against a second set of electronic forms for which program code is supposed to be available residing in a remote database the if the communications engine cannot match the electronic form of the visited network site to the first set of electronic forms.*" In combination with the other limitations recited in amended claim 34, none of the cited prior art discloses, teaches or suggests this combination of limitations. As a result, amended claim 34 is believed to be patentable over Kaply in view of Light et al. and further in view of Atlas et al. Claims 35, 38, 40, and 44-65 depend from amended claim 34 and therefore are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from amended claim 34.

Claim 66 has been amended to recite the additional limitations: "*wherein the electronic form is received from a visited network site*" and "*wherein the means for obtaining program code*

includes means for determining whether the program code resides in a local database utilizing a Universal Resource Locator (URL) of the visited network site obtained from a local browser, and means for contacting a remote database via a network to determine whether the program code resides in the remote database if the program code does not reside in the local database." None of the cited prior art discloses, teaches or suggests the combination of limitations as recited in the amended claim 64 and, therefore, amended claim 64 is believed to be patentable over Kaply in view of Light et al. and further in view of Bogdan.

Claim 67 has been amended to further define its scope so that the obtaining of program code for filling in the electronic form is achieved "by determining whether the program code resides in a local database utilizing a Universal Resource Locator (URL) of the visited network site obtained from a local browser, and contacting a remote database via a network to determine whether the program code resides in the remote database if the program code does not reside in the local database." None of the cited prior art discloses, teaches or suggests the combination of limitations as recited in the amended claim 67. Therefore, this claim, as amended is believed to be patentable over Kaply in view of Light et al. and further in view of Atlas et al.

Claim 82 has been amended in a fashion so that it now sets forth that the obtaining of the program code includes "*comparing information corresponding to the electronic form of the visited network site against information residing in a local database that corresponds to electronic forms for which program code is supposed to be available and against information residing in a remote database utilizing if the information matching the information corresponding to the electronic form does not reside in the local database, the information including a Universal Resource Locator (URL) of the visited network site obtained from a local browser application.*" None of the cited prior art discloses, teaches or suggests the combination of limitations as recited in the amended claim 82. Therefore, this claim, as amended is believed to be patentable over Kaply in view of Light et al. and further in view of Atlas et al.

Claims 83 and 84 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 82. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, claims 83 and 84 are now believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Thus, for at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-3215.

In addition, if for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. **05-0150**.

Date: September 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Vidya R. Bhakar
Registration No. 42,323

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777